

Howard Holderness, CA Bar No. 169814  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1 Market Street, Spear Tower, 25th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 442-1000 (Telephone)  
(415) 442-1001 (Facsimile)

Charles L. Babcock, IV, TX Bar No. 01479500  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
1401 McKinney, Suite 1900  
Houston, Texas 77010  
Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
(713) 752-4200 (Telephone)  
(713) 752-4221 (Facsimile)

George L. McWilliams  
LAW OFFICE OF GEORGE L. MCWILLIAMS, P.C.  
TX Bar No. 13877000; AR Bar No. 68078  
406 Walnut, P.O. Box 58  
Texarkana, ARK-TX 75504-0058  
Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
(903) 277-0098 (Telephone)  
(870) 773-2967 (Facsimile)

Attorneys for Respondent  
RICHARD FRENKEL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH, LLC,  
Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant,

vs.

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.,  
Defendant, Counterclaimant and Third  
Party Plaintiff,

vs.

SCOTT C. HARRIS,  
Third-Party Defendant and  
Counterclaimant

vs.

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.,  
Defendant, Counterclaimant, Third  
Party Plaintiff and Counterclaim  
Defendant

Miscellaneous Action No.  
CV 5:08-mc-80074-JF (HRL)

**RICHARD FRENKEL'S PARTIAL  
OPPOSITION TO *EX PARTE*  
APPLICATION BY ILLINOIS  
COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC AND  
SCOTT C. HARRIS PURSUANT TO  
LOCAL RULE 6.3 FOR ORDER  
SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING  
ON MOTION OF ILLINOIS  
COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC AND  
SCOTT C. HARRIS UNDER  
FED.R.CIV.P. 45 TO COMPEL  
RICHARD FRENKEL'S DEPOSITION  
AND DOCUMENT PRODUCTION IN  
APRIL 2008**

Hon. Magistrate Judge Howard Lloyd

1 Non-party Richard Frenkel ("Frenkel") respectfully submits this memorandum in  
 2 partial opposition to the *Ex Parte* Application Pursuant to Local Rule 6.3 for Order  
 3 Shortening Time for Hearing on Motion of Illinois Computer Research LLC and Scott C.  
 4 Harris under Fed.R.Civ.P. 45 to Compel Richard Frenkel's Deposition and Document  
 5 Production in April 2008 ("Application to Shorten Time") filed by Illinois Computer  
 6 Research, L.L.C. ("ICR") and Scott C. Harris ("Harris") (collectively, "Applicants") on  
 7 April 11, 2008.

8 Frenkel and his employer Cisco Systems, Inc. ("Cisco") (collectively,  
 9 "Respondents") informed Applicants, through counsel, that they would not insist upon the  
 10 35-day rule contained in Local Rule 7-2(a) for Applicants' motion to compel if (i) a  
 11 hearing date acceptable to the Court and all counsel could be agreed upon and (ii)  
 12 Frenkel's and Cisco's motion to quash and for protective order (filed on the same day as  
 13 the motion to compel and assigned to this court, No. CV 5:08-mc-80075-JF (HRL)) could  
 14 be heard at the same time. Babcock Decl. ¶ 2. Counsel for Frenkel and Cisco are  
 15 available on April 22, 2008, the date requested in the *ex parte* Application to Shorten  
 16 Time.<sup>1</sup> Babcock Decl. ¶ 2. Therefore, if the Court is available to hear Frenkel and  
 17 Cisco's motions to quash and for a protective order at the same time, Respondents have no  
 18 objection to April 22, 2008.

19 With that said, there is certainly no basis for saying, as Applicants do at page 2 of  
 20 the Application to Shorten Time, that hearing these matters in the ordinary course will  
 21 "cause [Applicants] substantial harm." The above-entitled action, currently pending in the  
 22 United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division, Case  
 23 No. 07 C 5081 (the "Chicago case"), was filed on September 10, 2007, and the sole  
 24 remaining defendant, Fish & Richardson, P.C. ("Fish"), answered on October 16, 2007.<sup>2</sup>

25  
 26 <sup>1</sup> This was not one of the dates discussed when Applicants' counsel and Frenkel and  
 Cisco's counsel were discussing agreed dates. Babcock Decl. ¶ 3.

27 <sup>2</sup> We request the Court to take judicial notice of all pleadings and supporting materials and  
 28 orders of the Chicago Court in the Chicago case. FED. R. EVID. 201

1 Just last week, the Court in the Chicago case (“the Chicago Court”) granted a defense  
 2 motion for leave to file an amended counterclaim and third-party complaint. Babcock  
 3 Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. A-1. The Chicago Court’s minute order states that “[d]ate to add additional  
 4 parties and to amend pleadings extended to 5/21/2008.” *Id.* In addition, by separate  
 5 minute order, the Chicago Court warned that “[i]f proceeding with depositions at this  
 6 point is premature, and depositions must be reopened following the naming of additional  
 7 parties, Plaintiff’s counsel will be required to pay the cost for the reopened depositions.”  
 8 Babcock Decl. ¶ 5, Ex. A-2. Discovery is to be completed by September 30, 2008.  
 9 Babcock Decl. ¶ 6, Ex. A-3.

10 Applicants state that they seek this expedited treatment “in order to comply with  
 11 the scheduling order in the [Chicago] case” (Application to Shorten Time p. 3) and that  
 12 “initial expert reports are due on June 30, 2008.” *Id.* Applicants do not explain what  
 13 possible testimony Frenkel would have germane to an expert report nor do they explain  
 14 what sort of expert they have retained. Nor do they explain how the current schedule will  
 15 hold given new parties being added to the case.

16 The Applicants’ motion to compel is currently set for hearing in this Court on May  
 17 13, 2008, a date which is convenient to Respondents’ counsel Babcock but not  
 18 McWilliams (who will be in trial). The Frenkel and Cisco motions are currently set  
 19 before this court on June 17, 2008. If the court wishes to move up the hearing date for the  
 20 Cisco and Frenkel motions to May 13, 2008 so that all the motions may be heard at the  
 21 same time, Respondents will not object to a hearing on May 13, 2008 despite  
 22 McWilliams’ unavailability.

23 In any event, Applicants’ purported reason they will suffer “substantial harm” is  
 24 meritless. This Court has held that the fact that a discovery deadline may pass before a  
 25 motion to compel is heard this “in no way precludes the court from ordering the discovery  
 26 to go forward, assuming the court concludes the motion to compel is granted.” *New*  
 27 *Medium Technologies, L.L.C. v. Barco, N.V.*, No. C 07-80226 MISC JF (RS), slip op. at 1  
 28

(N.D. Cal. Sept. 27, 2007) (denying motion to shorten time to hear motion to compel the deposition of a non-party witness in a case pending in United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois); *see Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Technologies, Inc.*, No. C 07-80276 JF (RS), slip op. at 2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 13, 2007); *Silicon Graphics, Inc. v. ATI Technologies, Inc.*, No. C 07-80283 JF (PVT), slip op. at 2 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 28, 2007). Babcock Decl. ¶¶ 7-9, Exs. A-4, A-5, A-6. The deadline for filing initial expert reports in the Chicago case has not expired and likely will not expire before this Court hears Applicants' Motion to Compel on May 13, 2008 or even June 17, 2008. Because Applicants have presented no other exigent circumstances that would compel this Court to disregard Local Rule 7-2(a), their Application to Shorten Time should be denied.

Moreover, even if the Chicago Court maintains the June 30, 2008 deadline for initial expert reports, Applicants do not cite any evidence, such as a declaration from one of their experts, that the 48 days between the Court's hearing on the Motion to Compel and the June 30, 2008 deadline is insufficient time for Applicants' experts to incorporate Frenkel's deposition testimony into their reports. Without such evidence, Applicants have not demonstrated that they will suffer "substantial harm." Thus, there is no need for this Court to disregard the usual, 35-day briefing schedule contained in Local Rule 7-2(a).

In conclusion, if the Court is available to hear Frenkel and Cisco's motions to quash and for a protective order at the same time as Applicants' motion to compel, Respondents have no objection to the Court hearing all such pending motions on April 22, 2008. However, if the Court will not hear all such pending motions on April 22, 2008, Respondents respectfully request that the Court deny the Application to Shorten Time for all the foregoing reasons, and further request that the Court consider the Motion to Compel, opposition thereto, and argument of counsel, as well as Frenkel, and Cisco's Motion to Quash and Motion for Protective Order at the noticed hearing on May 13, 2008 in accordance with Local Rule 7-2(a).

1 Dated: April 15, 2008

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

2 By 

3 Howard Holderness

4 Attorneys for Respondent  
RICHARD FRENKEL

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

5079659v1

5.

RICHARD FRENKEL'S OPPOSITION TO *EX PARTE*  
APPLICATION BY ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC  
AND SCOTT C. HARRIS PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6.3  
FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING

1 Dated: April 15, 2008

JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.

2  
3 By Charles L. Babcock  
Charles L. Babcock

4 Attorneys for Respondent  
5 RICHARD FRENKEL  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28


5079659v1

6. RICHARD FRENKEL'S OPPOSITION TO *EX PARTE*  
APPLICATION BY ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC  
AND SCOTT C. HARRIS PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6.3  
FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING

1  
2 Dated: April 15, 2008

LAW OFFICE OF GEORGE L. MCWILLIAMS,  
P.C.

3  
4 By



George L. McWilliams

5  
6 Attorneys for Respondent  
RICHARD FRENKEL

7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

5079659v1

7.

RICHARD FRENKEL'S OPPOSITION TO *EX PARTE*  
APPLICATION BY ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC  
AND SCOTT C. HARRIS PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6.3  
FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING

Howard Holderness, CA Bar No. 169814  
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP  
1 Market Street, Spear Tower, 25th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
(415) 442-1000 (Telephone)  
(415) 442-1001 (Facsimile)

Charles L. Babcock, IV, TX Bar No. 01479500  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.  
1401 McKinney, Suite 1900  
Houston, Texas 77010  
Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
(713) 752-4200 (Telephone)  
(713) 752-4221 (Facsimile)

George L. McWilliams  
LAW OFFICE OF GEORGE L. MCWILLIAMS, P.C.  
TX Bar No. 13877000; AR Bar No. 68078  
406 Walnut, P.O. Box 58  
Texarkana, ARK-TX 75504-0058  
Admitted Pro Hac Vice  
(903) 277-0098 (Telephone)  
(870) 773-2967 (Facsimile)

Attorneys for Respondent  
RICHARD FRENKEL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH, LLC,  
Plaintiff and Counterclaim Defendant,

vs.

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.,  
Defendant, Counterclaimant and Third  
Party Plaintiff,

vs.

SCOTT C. HARRIS,  
Third-Party Defendant and  
Counterclaimant

vs.

FISH & RICHARDSON P.C.,  
Defendant, Counterclaimant, Third  
Party Plaintiff and Counterclaim  
Defendant

Miscellaneous Action No.  
CV 5:08-mc-80074-JF (HRL)

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to the within action. My business address is One Market St., Spear Tower, San Francisco, CA 94105.

On April 15, 2008, I served on the interested parties in said action the within document(s) as indicated on the attached service list:

**RICHARD FRENKEL'S PARTIAL OPPOSITION TO *EX PARTE* APPLICATION BY ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC AND SCOTT C. HARRIS PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 6.3 FOR ORDER SHORTENING TIME FOR HEARING ON MOTION OF ILLINOIS COMPUTER RESEARCH LLC AND SCOTT C. HARRIS UNDER FED.R.CIV.P. 45 TO COMPEL RICHARD FRENKEL'S DEPOSITION AND DOCUMENT PRODUCTION IN APRIL 2008**

- ☒ (Via Overnight Delivery – Federal Express) by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed Federal Express envelope and affixing a pre-paid air bill, and causing the envelope to be delivered to a Federal Express agent for overnight delivery
- ☒ by transmitting **via facsimile** the document(s) listed above on this date.
- ☐ by causing the documents to be delivered by electronic mail addressed as set forth below.
- ☐ by causing the documents to be delivered by hand to the offices of the interested parties.

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the above is true and correct. Signed April 15, 2008, in San Francisco, California.

*Catherine Greenblatt*

**SERVICE LIST**

Raymond P. Niro  
Paul K. Vickrey  
Richard B. Megley, Jr.  
Karen L. Blouin  
Niro, Scavone, Haller & Niro  
181 West Madison, Suite 4600  
Chicago, IL 60602  
(312) 236-0733  
(312) 236-3137 - Facsimile

**Attorneys for Plaintiff, ILLINOIS  
COMPUTER RESEARCH, LLC and  
SCOTT C. HARRIS, Third Party  
Defendant**

David J. Bradford  
Terrence J. Truax  
Eric A. Sacks  
Daniel J. Weiss  
Jenner & Block, LLP  
330 North Wabash Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60611  
(312) 222-9350  
(312) 527-0484 - Facsimile

**Attorneys for FISH & RICHARDSON,  
P.C., Defendant**

Charles L. Babcock, IV  
Jackson Walker  
1401 McKinney, Suite 1900  
Houston, Texas 77010

**Attorneys for Respondent CISCO  
SYSTEMS, INC.**

George L. McWilliams  
Law Offices of George L. McWilliams, P.C.  
406 Walnut, P.O. Box 58  
Texarkana, ARK 71854-5219

**Attorneys for Respondent RICHARD  
FRENKEL**

5079659v.1 132824/00003